



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/763,633	01/22/2004	Susan G. Yan	GP-303571	7710
65798	7590	07/15/2008	EXAMINER	
MILLER IP GROUP, PLC			WALKER, KEITH D	
GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
42690 WOODWARD AVENUE				
SUITE 200			1795	
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48304				
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
07/15/2008	PAPER			

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10763633	1/22/2004	YAN ET AL.	GP-303571

EXAMINER

KEITH WALKER

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

1795 20080707

DATE MAILED:

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner for Patents**

The Reply Brief filed May 15, 2008 is accepted and entered into the record.

On page 2 of the Reply Brief, appellant states that a previous rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph was made and then withdrawn after amendment. Appellant is correct, once the amendment was made that particular rejection was withdrawn. This has no bearing on the current rejection at hand, the rejections are different.

At the top of page 4, appellant cites only semantics are an issue and questions that this issue was not brought up earlier in prosecution of the application. The amendment was not presented earlier in prosecution for the issue to be brought up. The application was appealed directly after the amendment, so the Examiner's Answer was the first chance at addressing the new limitation.

On page 5, appellant alleges the claim language "drying the MEA under a heat lamp as the catalyst ink is being sprayed during several passes" is equal to "spraying the membrane and at the same time drying the membrane". The claim language is not limited to appellant's interpretation of concurrently spraying and drying. Passing the MEA though an oven after spraying and repeating the process meets this limitation.

/PATRICK RYAN/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795